

Business Notices.

THE DISUNION QUESTION.

MR. RAYMOND'S FOUR LETTERS TO HON. W. L. YANCY ON THE ISSUES AND TENDENCIES OF THE DISUNION MOVEMENT, have been published in Pamphlet form, and may be had at The Times Office. Price 8 cents for single copies; \$4 per hundred.

PHRENOLOGICAL EXAMINATIONS.

WITH CHARTS AND WRITTEN DESCRIPTIONS OF CHARACTER, Given daily by FOWLER AND WELLS, No. 286 Broadway, New York.

BARRY'S TRICHOPOREUS is the best and cheapest article for Dressing, Shaving, Cleaning, Grooming, Preserving and Restoring the Hair. Ladies try it. Sold by Druggists.

GROVER & BAKER'S CELEBRATED SEWING-MACHINES, No. 485 Broadway, N. Y. \$40 and upward.

STEELE'S PATENT FEATHER BRUSHES. Three hundred varieties for Stock and House Use. Extra Clean and Superior. Dealers, CROSBY, DUNN, FOSTER, PETERSON AND MURPHY, 110 Nassau Street, N. Y. STEELE & CO., No. 3 Park Row, opp. Astor House.

It will pay to read DAILEY & CO.'S advertisement in the Dry Goods column of this paper. After you have done that, call at their store, No. 61 Broadway, and see the Goods.

EUREKA SEWING-MACHINES, at reduced rates. Principal Office, No. 485 Broadway, N. Y. D. J. LEE, Superintendent. Descriptions of the merits, Pros and Cons, and prices, will be received in payment.

TRUSSES.—MARSH & CO.'S Radical-cure TRUSS office, No. 2 Vesey-st. (Astor House), opposite the church. Silk Elastic Stockings for Varicose Veins, Shoulder Braces and Supporters, and improved Surgical Bandages. A lady attendant.

TOWER CLOCKS, REGULATORS, AND OFFICE CLOCKS—the most accurate timekeepers in the world. SPERRY & CO., No. 467 Broadway.

New-York Daily Tribune.

MONDAY, JANUARY 7, 1861.

No notice can be taken of Anonymous Communications. What ever is intended for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer—not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith. Business letters should in all cases be addressed to THE NEW-YORK TRIBUNE. We cannot undertake to return rejected Communications.

THE TRIBUNE IN PHILADELPHIA.—W. B. ZIEGLER, No. 100 South Third-st., is our Agent in Philadelphia, and subscribers can have THE TRIBUNE promptly served by carriers in almost all parts of the city. Our friends in PHILADELPHIA, N. J., can obtain THE DAILY TRIBUNE, at WEEKLY TRIBUNE, at the South, No. 92 Warren Street.

The Tribune Almanac for 1861.

This popular annual will be ready in a few days. In order to publish the Election Returns as full as possible, delay has been unavoidable.

Gov. Hicks has published an address to the citizens of Maryland, giving his reasons for refusing to convene the Legislature.

The friends of W. H. Russell, in Lafayette County, Mo., are reported to have signed bonds amounting to \$1,000,000, which will be tendered to the Federal authorities for his release from prison.

The seizure of fortifications and arsenals throughout the South, it appears, is a part of the secession programme. A dispatch from Savannah informs us that the pretext that it was necessary to take possession of the forts and arsenals in that city, to prevent their falling into the hands of the populace, is a mere subterfuge. The fact is, the act was perpetrated to hasten forward the secession movement in that State, the people showing less interest in the treason than suited the leading traitors. An attack on the Federal capital is the common talk in Savannah, and the possession of the forts and arsenals in that section is regarded as necessary for the purpose.

They take sensible views of some things in Pennsylvania. Mr. G. R. Smith of the House of Representatives of that State, has proposed some resolutions "relative to the state of the country, and the distress and trouble brought upon it by the unconstitutional and disunion movement of the State of South Carolina." Mr. Smith does not seem to be of the opinion of Mr. Douglas, that the Republicans have done it all.

THE CABINET.

We have a little additional intelligence respecting the progress of Mr. Lincoln's efforts to organize his Cabinet, which will no doubt be interesting to the public.

We are now able to state on the best of authority that Mr. Seward has not yet accepted the portfolio of the State Department. The offer has been made to him by Mr. Lincoln, and he has it under advisement, but, as we believe, has not yet come to a determination on the subject. We presume, however, that Mr. Lincoln had reason to suppose that he would accept before he made the proposition. We sincerely trust that he will not decline. There are few men in the country who could conduct its foreign relations with the ability, dignity, and tact which Mr. Seward would bring to the duty. It is not necessary for us to add here that we place no confidence in the Wall street reports which attribute to Mr. Seward a secret complicity in the Crittenden Compromise. Such reports are, as we believe, without the least foundation in truth.

A dispatch in *The Herald* states that Caleb B. Smith of Indiana is to be substituted for Mr. Chase as the representative of the North-West, in the Cabinet. This we believe to be a total mistake. Nor will any one think it disrespectful to Mr. Smith to say that the people of the country would regard it as a serious misfortune to lose the eminent qualities, character, and administrative abilities of Mr. Chase from the ministry of a Republican President.

The invitation which, as there is reason to believe, Mr. Lincoln has addressed to Mr. Cameron, does not specify precisely the position which that gentleman is desired to occupy, but mentions both the War Department and the Treasury; and hence, probably, it is that his personal friends have positively alleged that he has been appointed to that office. We suppose that we do not transcend the bounds of propriety, when we state that the report of this appointment has caused surprise and roused opposition, both at Washington and in Pennsylvania. What effect the remonstrances that have been dispatched to Springfield will have upon Mr. Lincoln, remains to be seen. With the Republicans of other States, the fact that the influence of Mr. Wilmet (who, in case of Mr. Cameron's withdrawal from the Senate, will possibly be his successor in that body) was warmly exerted to secure the distinction which Mr. Lincoln has already bestowed upon him, will weigh in Mr. Cameron's favor.

For the office of Secretary of the Interior, efforts are making in influential quarters to induce Mr. Lincoln to choose the Hon. John A. Gilmer of North Carolina, instead of Mr. Graham.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE NORTH.

To the Hon. JOHN J. CRITTENDEN, U. S. Senate.

DEAR SIR: The People of the Free States observe and appreciate your efforts to reconcile what are improperly termed "sectional" differences and maintain the integrity of the Union. They do not doubt your sincerity nor your patriotism. They realize that, even when you meet wronged yourself in upholding the policy embodied in the Nebraska bill and the consequent dragging of the free settlers of Kansas with intent to bend their necks to the yoke of Slavery, you yielded to a local ignorance and prejudice which you could not control, and which, because you would not minister unreservedly to its wild exactions, has consigned you to private life after the 4th of March next. They make due allowance for the ferocity of the Pro-Slavery fanaticism which has thus ostracized you, and leniently judge that, though a bolder man might have done better, an average man would have done worse; and they are not ungrateful for your honest and earnest efforts to save the Union from disruption and the country from the horrors of civil war. They feel sure that, were the People of the Slave States in the average as enlightened and as just as you are, the dangers now impending might be dispelled or averted. Nevertheless, they do not and will not assent to the Compromise proposed by you—that is a fixed fact. Here and there one who never shared their convictions, but only affected them in order to get himself elected to some high office, or who owns real estate in Washington City and feels that it is likely to be ruined by Disunion, or who has a great Railroad contract in Missouri or some other Slave State, and may be broken by the depreciation of that State's bonds, or who is a lame duck in the Stock Market and hopes to win back all he has lost and more with it if a Compromise can be fixed up, may accede to your project or to something equivalent; but ninety-nine of every hundred Republicans are opposed to any such bargain, and will not be concluded by it if made. Moreover, thousands of Democrats and of Conservatives who stood with you on the platform of "The Union, the Constitution, and the enforcement of the Laws," are also opposed to any such arrangement while the Federal authority is defied and the Union threatened with subversion. Let me briefly set forth the reasons which unite the North in resistance to any Compromise at present:

I. One State to-day is in open rebellion against the Federal authority; others are preparing to follow her immediately. Federal arsenals and forts, containing great numbers of cannon, many thousand stand of arms, and great quantities of military stores, have been seized and are now held by the insurgents, not in South Carolina only, but in Georgia, Alabama, and I believe other Slave States which have not yet declared themselves out of the Union. The slender Federal garrison of the forts in Charleston harbor is this hour in peril of destruction by an overwhelming rebel force, and not only its commander, but the President of the United States is railed at and defamed because that commander has concentrated his three or four score soldiers in that fortress where they can hold out longest and sell their lives most dearly. The Federal Custom-House at Charleston has been turned over to the State, and the late U. S. Collector assumes to clear vessels on the authority of the nation of South Carolina. That pseudo nation assumes to be out of the Union, withdraws her Members from Congress, and sends Embassadors to Washington as to a foreign capital. In view of these high-handed proceedings, and the scarcely dissembled menace that all the Federal forts in the South will soon be seized by the Disunionists, and the inauguration of Lincoln at Washington on the 4th of March next prevented by an insurgent force, the People of the Free States very naturally rebel any compromise that will enable these rebels to boast that they have frightened or backed down the North. We are not frightened hereabouts; we do not feel a bit sorry for what we have done; and we do not capitulate to traitors. If, then, what you propose were inherently admissible, we could not assent to it now.

II. I need not tell you that what you propose (the line of 36° 30', with free course to Slavery below it) has been thrice offered to and thrice rejected by the Free States. We deem it unfair on many grounds, but conspicuously because, when Louisiana, Florida, and Texas were successively acquired, the fact that they were previously slaveholding was relied on to bar any demand that they should henceforth be even half free; and we insist that the rule which gave them to Slavery now consecrates New-Mexico and Arizona to Freedom. You would not expect Republicans to vote for your project if there were no threats and no danger of Disunion or violent resistance to Mr. Lincoln's rule; and you must not hope to extort from our fears what you could not expect us to concede from a sense of justice. You do not mean to degrade us; but your proposition, if accepted, would have that effect; and you must allow us to judge what is due to our own honor.

III. Your friends in the Slave States do not talk right. Take the following samples from the resolves of a Union meeting held on the 1st inst., in your own city of Frankfort, Ky., and addressed by your friend, Gen. Combs:

"That the resolutions of compromise submitted by Mr. Crittenden in the U. S. Senate, should have met with prompt acceptance by the people of all the States, and by their constituted representatives, and while we ask for nothing more, we will submit to nothing less."

"That we condemn all hasty and precipitate action by individuals or States; but, being under like condemnation, we cordially sympathize with the people of the other Slave States, and if all other redress shall fail, we will cordially and promptly appeal to them to the God of Battles, in defense of our common rights, and in redress for our common wrongs."

Is this conciliation? Your friends propose to decide the matter in issue between themselves and us, and then to enforce their decision by a prompt appeal to "the God of Battles." Is not yours a demand that they should henceforth be even half free; and we insist that the rule which gave them to Slavery now consecrates New-Mexico and Arizona to Freedom. You would not expect Republicans to vote for your project if there were no threats and no danger of Disunion or violent resistance to Mr. Lincoln's rule; and you must not hope to extort from our fears what you could not expect us to concede from a sense of justice. You do not mean to degrade us; but your proposition, if accepted, would have that effect; and you must allow us to judge what is due to our own honor.

IV. I am not forgetting that you propose a submission of your proposition to the judgment of the People, each Congressional District to have

one vote upon it. But this would not be fair, for many reasons. In the first place, the Slave States would have a dozen more, the Free States a dozen less, than their present population entitles them to respectively. But, beyond this, you know, as I know, that there can be no fair submission to a popular vote. In every district of the Free States, your side of the question could not and would be fully and fairly argued; it could not on our side be argued, nor could votes be polled in the Slave States. You, for example, need not be told that they will be heard with polite attention by large audiences in any Republican State; but I assure you that Gov. Wise and Mr. Yancy may speak as freely and will be heard as patiently in Worcester, in Auburn, in St. Lawrence, in Wilmet's district, as any Republican. But would I be allowed to set forth to the non-slaveholding whites of the Slave States my reasons for wishing Slavery excluded from the Territories? Could I even be allowed freely to distribute throughout the Slave States journals and documents setting forth my view of the question? You know that we could not be allowed to present our side to the people of the Slave States, though you may not know the fact that not one-third of those citizens of Slave States who wanted Mr. Lincoln elected dared vote for him. It was so in your own State; so in others; it would be so if a vote were taken on your proposition. We would not be allowed to present our case to your people; and even those who, without such presentation, are with us, would not be free to vote as they think. Have you forgotten the destruction of more than one Anti-Slavery press by Kentucky mobs? do you not recall the expulsion of the leading families from Berea in your State for no pretense of fault but their hostility to Slavery? You are a lawyer and a good one: would you like to submit a great case to a jury one-half of whom were not allowed to hear your argument, and could only give you a verdict at the peril of their lives?

V. The People of the Slave, and especially of the Cotton States, have for thirty years been taught that the Union taxes and impoverishes them for the benefit of the North. Believing this, they are frequently impelled to menace us with Disunion, presuming that we will do or say anything to avert that calamity to our section. It is high time that mischievous delusion were dispelled, since the North can have neither equality nor peace in the Union until it shall be. The issue having been fairly made up—Let the North recede from its principles or bid adieu to the Union—I do not see how we can make any concession of principle without dishonor. We regard it as a dictate of conscience—so Mr. Webster taught us—that we should never consent to an extension of the area of Slavery. We mean to be faithful to that conviction.

—Mr. Crittenden! the People of the Free States, with every respect for you, propose to stand by the Constitution as it is; to respect the rightful authorities, State and Federal; to let Congress enact such laws as to the majority shall seem good; and to back the Executive in enforcing those laws and maintaining the integrity of the Union. For whatever troubles may impend or arise, those who conspire and rebel are justly responsible; if they would submit when beaten, as we do, there would be unbroken peace and prosperity. If the system established by our fathers is to give place to one of South-American pronouncements and revolts by the defeated in each election, let us know it now, and be prepared to act accordingly. In any case, allow me with deference to suggest that your proper place is with those who, whether in or out of power, defer to rightfully-constituted Government and uphold the majesty of Law.

Yours, HORACE GREELEY.

New-York, Jan. 7, 1861.

EX-SENATOR BENJAMIN ON HUMAN PROPERTY.

There are two formulas, both propounded by distinguished and widely different men, which laconically express the fact and the fallacy of slaveholding. "Property in man" said Dr. Channing, with his usual elegance, and more than his usual vigor; "you might as well talk of 'property in angels!'" On the other hand, Mr. Clay, with the crisp and axiomatic brevity of a lawyer, said: "That is property which the law 'makes property';" which sufficiently would settle the whole question, provided the law could make property of whatever law-givers might please to call by that name. If Mr. Clay had considered the matter philosophically and not passionately, he would have seen that, potent as Senators and Representatives usually are, they cannot control the forces and the facts of Nature. A law requiring all apple-trees to blossom in October and to bear in March, though enacted *en masse* contradiendo, and approved by a regiment of governors, and declared to be a Christian ordinance by a score of synods, and sanctioned as constitutional by whole benches of judges, would not put a single pipkin upon the boughs or into the barrels in the specified month. When Senator Benjamin—we beg his pardon: we must give him a title of which we suppose he is proud—when ex-Senator Benjamin of Louisiana made his recent dramatic display in the Chamber, he talked of four billion dollars worth of men, which gave his peroration rather a pecuniary than a pathetic tint. No Yankee, fresh from swops and dicker, could have taken more kindly than Mr. Benjamin did to the shilling side of the question. Our property, our ravished property, our endangered property—this was the burden of his Senatorial swan-song. He was indignant, just as a farmer is indignant upon discovering his hen-house ravished—to all the statesmanship consistent with a pervading sordidness did Mr. Benjamin rise—to nothing higher and manlier.

It is unfortunate for Mr. Benjamin that his idea of property is one which has never been admitted by lexicographers, or logicians, or political economists. Property refers, not to men, but to things. Property, according to Worcester, is "the thing possessed." Property in law, according to Burrill, cited by Worcester, is "the unrestricted and exclusive right to a thing." The quality of property is permanence. Acres do of abscond. Houses never run away. These are real property. Then, of property which is called personal, we notice that it does not contain within itself the power of effecting transfer. There must be donor and donee, vendor and vendee, pledge and pledgee. Bullion, which is the symbol of all personal property, is said to take wings; but it does not take them before some active intelligence has made them. The Treasury securities did not commit larcenies of themselves the other day; they were stolen by their custodian. Horses, to be sure, run away, and so do negroes, and so do our New-York

Postmaster; but if this proves negroes to be horses, it also proves Isaac V. Fowler to be a horse. Senator Benjamin, if we may credit his own statement, is about to run away, or has already run away, from duties which he is sworn to fulfill; but this does not prove him to be a horse, or even an ass, except figuratively; it does not prove him so, if for no other reason, because horses are incapable of committing perjury.

The late Senator from Louisiana and all slaveholding Senators, late or present, grievously blunder when they talk of slaves as property in a plain and unqualified way. They do not see that it is the qualification in the mind of every thinking person that saves them and their inconsistent chattel system from contempt and hatred. The South has lived for more than half a century upon good-natured Northern extenuations—upon the prevalent desire to make out slaveholding something better and different from man-holding, wife-selling, or child-stealing. That is to say: when philanthropists have talked of the auction-block, philanthropists of another sort have talked of the black man's beautiful cottage. When honest men have objected to the wholesale slaveholding and exposure in market-overs of the yellow progeny of the planters, somebody always steps in with an armful of statistics to prove that the poor blacks are greatly given to church-going. Many of these animals are indulgently treated, which proves—that they are not animals at all! Doctors of Divinity and constitutional lawyers, out of the Bible, out of the Pandects, have labored to convince us that Slavery is a social system pleasing to God, the regenerate heart, and political common sense. We have heard, times without number, from uncounted pulpits, that the slave is a member of society, which, in spite of Mr. Benjamin's Israelitish protest, we declare that "property" never is and never can be. If Slavery is a social relation, then it is not a system of property. Southern philosophers and Northern sycophants may choose between the two theories; but they are not entitled to the benefit of both, because the two are absolutely incompatible.

If, then, Slavery be considered as a mere social relation, the whole plea for equality of privileges in the Territories falls to the ground. Mr. Benjamin has undoubtedly a right to emigrate to Kansas; but it does not follow that he has a right to carry there the social relations of Louisiana. He might as well insist upon taking with him Mr. Livingston's Code or the Municipal Law of New-Orleans. Suppose gambling-hells and bawdy-houses are licensed in the Crescent City; does it follow that fare and prostitution will be legal in Nebraska? These illustrations may be thought impolite, and so let us offer others. Mr. Benjamin may be married (if he is not already married) in a certain way at home; would he have a right to be married in the same way in Oregon? Polygamy, or, as was recently, just as firmly established in Utah as Slavery is in South Carolina; may Brigham Young, then, go to housekeeping in this city with his ninety-and-nine wives? Property is everywhere protected by the comity of civilized nations. Can Mr. Benjamin, therefore, flog, paddle and pickle his negro in full convulcent at Exeter Hall? Piracy was for many years a social institution of Algiers; man-eating was the same in New-Zealand; but in no Christian waters did the corsair swim with impunity, and in no Christian market would the tattooed epicure have found Spring babies for his table.

Slavery being a social relation—and it can be nothing else—the slave cannot be regarded merely as a beast. No man holds social relations—certainly not in this part of the country—with his hog or his donkey. If they prefer such swinish or assine company in Louisiana, we are quite free to say that it is none of our business, and one of those questions of taste about which there can be no dispute. If Mr. Benjamin likes a theory which may make things his cousins, goods his uncles, and chattels his aunts, we wish him joy of his family, and so leave him; with our hearty protest, notwithstanding, against such Circæan transmigrations in yet untainted Commonwealths.

DR. RAPHAEL'S BIBLE.

The Rev. Dr. Raphael is a burning and a shining light in our New-York Israel. As Senator Wade said of his co-religionist, Judah P. Benjamin, he is "an Israelite with Egyptian principles." On the President's Fast-day, he preached a sermon in the Greene-street Synagogue, wherein he demonstrated, to his own satisfaction, that Human Slavery is sanctioned by Divine law. Now, in so far as the Rev. Dr. assumed to quote and to expound the Law of Moses, we let him pass, and proceed to the other branch of the subject. We quote from a report of his discourse as follows:

"But, as that Rev. gentleman (Henry Ward Beecher) takes as his text those who most loudly and most vehemently denounce slaveholding as a sin, I wished to convince myself whether he had not a Scriptural warranty for so doing; and whether such denunciation was one of those 'requirements for moral instruction' advanced by the New Testament. I have accordingly examined the various books of Christian Scripture, and find that they afford the Reverend gentleman and his co-peers no authority whatever for his and their declamations. The New Testament nowhere, directly or indirectly, condemns slaveholding—which indeed is proved by the universal practice of all Christian nations during many centuries."

—Dr. Raphael is an educated and reverent expounder of the Law given by Moses, and we have therefore not seen fit to put our authority against his in the interpretation of that Law. But, when he comes to the New Testament, we feel that we have him at a decided disadvantage. We have been studying that book a good many years, receiving it as a message from on high; while he deems it an imposture, or no Divine authority, and appears to have only casually looked it through to see whether it does or does not sustain Slavery. He says "the New Testament nowhere, directly or indirectly, condemns 'slaveholding';" we say it does, especially in this passage, which is the center and sun of the whole system of Christianity:

"ALL THINGS WHATSOEVER YE WOULD THAT MEN SHOULD DO TO YOU, DO YE EVEN SO TO THEM." (Matt. vii. 12.)

Jesus of Nazareth, who lays down this broad, comprehensive, universal rule of human conduct, adds "for this is the Law and the Prophets," and we believe he had a clearer, deeper, truer comprehension of their spirit than has Mr. Raphael; yet we will not dispute with the Rev. Doctor on that point. But that the Author and Finisher of the Christian faith intended to lay down as absolute and without exception the rule that we must never, under any circumstances, do to another what we would not have that other, if our positions were reversed, do to us, the universal, emphatic accord of Christian commentators for nearly twenty centuries, has af-

firmed; and the context renders it certain that Christ meant just this, and nothing else.

We might quote other passages to the same effect, particularly that concerning "a certain man" who "went down to Jericho" and "fell among thieves," and, being by them "stripped, and wounded, and left for dead," was looked upon and left to get on as he might by "a priest," and "a Levite," who, we judge by certain characteristics, to have both been ancestors of the Rev. Dr. Raphael. But Christ explicitly condemned their heartless conduct, commending that of the good Samaritan, who, seeing a fellow creature in distress, stopped not to consider that he was of a detested race and lineage, but flew to his relief, bound up his wounds, and ministered to his every need. He who does not feel that this narrative is aimed directly at such religionists as Dr. Raphael may be a very good Jew (we don't believe he is, but the Dr. is better authority for that than we are), but he is certainly the poorest sort of Christian.

Can any one need to be shown that Christ's Golden Rule is utterly, irreconcilably hostile to Slavery? Suppose a son or daughter of the Rev. Dr. Raphael were this day a slave in Dahomey, would he doubt its application to the case? And if that rule condemn the enslavement of a Jew by a negro, just as clearly does it condemn the enslavement of a negro by a Jew. No Hebrewist pretends that the Slavery allowed by Moses ("for the hardness of your hearts") was the Slavery of negroes exclusively, or was confined to any particular race or color. The "heathen round about" the Israelites, when the Law was given by Moses, were not negroes, nor anything like negroes, but Arabs and Phenicians, scarcely distinguishable by physical or mental characteristics from the Hebrews themselves.

Christ was born into a world full of Slavery, as Dr. Raphael asserts. Where is that Slavery now? Vanished—melted away in the light of Christian equity, the fire of Christian love. On Sunday next the very last Christian nation in Europe that held slaves will cease to hold them, leaving Mohammedan Turkey the only slaveholding country in the most enlightened and Christian quarter of the globe. The Catholic Church has formally declared that Slavery was overthrown by Christianity, which no one who studies history can doubt. Christianity is gradually rooting out Slavery in Asia and America, and fighting it even in Africa. In the presence of these facts, what weight is due to the circumstance that Christ never specially condemned Slavery? "By their fruits ye shall know them."

It is a sad, a deplorable fact, that Slavery unfits men for Freedom. The slave of yesterday is the hardest master to-day, and the Irish kerne, trampled under foot for twenty generations, make just about the meanest Douglasses in America. No people on earth have been more oppressed, robbed, trodden down, and persecuted, than the Jews; hence we naturally look to them to furnish apologists and pettifoggers for Slavery. We rejoice in the knowledge, however, that only a part of them are thus perverted, but that thousands of the children of Abraham, purified and made wiser by suffering, are among the most faithful and consistent upholders of the inalienable Rights of Man.

IS COTTON KING?

The basis of the confidence manifested by the Planting States in their ability to establish and maintain a Southern Confederacy is tersely embodied in the current political phrase, "Cotton is King." These States have hitherto enjoyed a sort of monopoly throughout the markets of the civilized world as producers of Cotton, and have actually come to believe that they alone can supply the demand. We are told that, by simply refusing to sell to our manufacturers, they can create general industrial and financial ruin, and thus coerce our consciences and intellects by an irresistible appeal to our pockets.

Nothing can be more fallacious. Leaving out of sight their own evident necessity to sell, which is quite equal to our need to buy, and assuming that, for the first time in the history of commerce, money will cease to command its equivalent, this supposed monopoly is temporary and fictitious, and can be speedily overthrown. Cotton has been raised for ages in India, Persia, Egypt, the West Indies, Japan, and Australia. No country in the world is so favorable to its growth as Africa. There, as we are told by Dr. Livingstone, the American cotton-plant is perennial, grows wild in the most wonderful profusion, and is cleared off as a nuisance to make room for the culture of vegetables.

The present artificial preeminence of our Planting States arises only from the fact that there, for the first time, Anglo-Saxon energy, under substantial and pacific political institutions, has been applied to agriculture in a climate capable of this product. Nor would this alone have sufficed; for under the present commercial and political union of Free and Slave States, the ingenuity and intellect of Northern mechanics have essentially contributed to this result. Free Labor has produced the Cotton-Gin, the Spinning-Jenny, and all the varied machinery which have rendered Cotton practically available. In 1784, eight bags of cotton, shipped from America to England, were seized there, on the ground that so much could not have been produced in the United States. At that time, the tedious labor of a slave for one entire day cleaned only a single pound of cotton from the seed. But in 1793, Eli Whitney—a Massachusetts Puritan by birth and a Connecticut Yankee by adoption—invented the gin which cleans 300 pounds in a day. The effect was magical. Southern industry revived. Slavery renewed its expiring lease of life. An enormous production followed, yet has scarcely kept pace with the ever-growing demand. One hundred years ago there was not a cotton shirt, nor a yard of cotton domestics in all America. Now, cotton fabrics are necessities of life and enter into the clothing of every individual.

But while the science and civilization of free society have been thus enlisted in the development of Southern Industry, the competition of Free Labor in the production of the great staple has been virtually prohibited. Every foot of our Southern territory has been consecrated in advance to servile institutions, and now it is loudly proclaimed that only by the toil of the slave can cotton be profitably produced. Fortunately, the facts are otherwise. The culture of cotton by free labor has already commenced, and is rapidly progressing under British auspices. The annual product of Hindostan alone is estimated at 450,000,000 lbs., of which about two-thirds are consumed at home and the remainder is shipped in equal proportions to China

and England. Nothing but means of transportation is needed to increase this amount indefinitely, and railroads for that purpose are now in process of construction. Burmah and British India export to China 40,000 bales annually. In the little African colony of Sierra Leone, the export of cotton has advanced from 1810 lbs., in the year 1852, to 96,470 lbs., in 1856. In 1856, Egypt exported 105,400 bales, and the East Indies shipped 485,300 bales. On our own continent, Brazil in 1853 exported 132,400 bales. During the early part of the present century, she was only second to the United States in her export of cotton, and has since only neglected it for the more profitable growth of Coffee.

If, therefore, our Planting States secede from the Union, and especially if they fulfill their threats of prohibiting the sale of Northern manufactures and of laying an export duty on our purchases of their Cotton, we have a remedy in our own hands better and more efficient than war. By a fair and honorable contract with some of the Mexican, Central American, or South American Republican States, which all hate Slavery, we can open the finest regions in the world to Northern emigration. Let us invite the brain and muscle of New-England into the tropics. By the universal testimony of travelers, from Humboldt to the present day, the elevated tablelands of tropical America are perfectly adapted to the white race, and even better adapted to the culture of Cotton and Sugar than any portion of our Southern States. In Central America, at an altitude of 5,000 feet, the pine and the palm flourish side by side. Cotton grows wild, not an annual plant, as in Georgia, cut down by frost every Fall, and replanted every Spring, but as a perennial shrub, bearing two crops every year for many successive seasons. At Antigua de Guatemala, 5,000 feet above the sea, the Date-Palm matures its fruit. In St. Salvador the cocoa-nut tree, and other luxuriant forms of vegetation strictly tropical, delight the eye, at an altitude of 2,500 feet above the sea. In these favored climes the extremes of heat and cold are alike unknown. There, on a common ground, the white and colored races attain an equally perfect physical development. Indeed, natural conditions are so favorable to civilization that there alone upon our continent its indigenous development has taken place. There, Cortez and Pizarro found cultivated Indian nations with organized political and social institutions. The manufacture of cotton cloth actually existed on the tablelands of Mexico and Peru long before their discovery by Europeans. It is because these countries are so admirably adapted to Cotton and Sugar that they have lately been ravaged by filibusters—the armed missionaries and propagandists of Slavery.

Let it, therefore, be distinctly understood that Nature has conferred on our Slave States no monopoly in Cotton. If they should be submerged in the ocean, new sources of supply would be speedily opened, and civilization would receive no permanent injury. It is impossible to overestimate the results which will follow the introduction of free labor, under republican institutions, into the tropics. If our political troubles should be the means of preserving these fertile and beautiful regions from the curse of Slavery, we shall be amply repaid for our present suffering, and its Southern authors will be celebrated in the annals of posterity as the unconscious and unintentional benefactors of their race.

A VOICE FROM SOUTH CAROLINA.

In the better days of South Carolina, before she was wholly given over to madness and rebellion, she numbered among the ablest and wisest of her citizens, Thomas S. Grimké. He died in 1854, and at a meeting of the bar of Charleston called to pay honor to his memory, the Attorney-General of the State, who was no less a personage than the present leader of secession, Robert Barnwell Rhett, though he then bore the less aristocratic name of Smith, made an address in which he stated that Mr. Grimké stood at the head of his profession in South Carolina, and "as a statesman, his views were comprehensive, his knowledge extensive and accurate, and his motives above suspicion or imputation. A purer and more devoted spirit never spoke or felt for the interests of his country."

During the Nullification excitement in South Carolina, Mr. Grimké, then a member of the State Senate, made a most able and elaborate speech in favor of the Union, in which he thus conclusively disposed of the question of State Sovereignty and of the constitutional right of a State to secede from the Confederacy:

"There never was a time when the States were regarded as separate nations by other nations. The United States, even before the Articles of Confederation, were one nation, as to the rest of the world. The colonies appeared before the world as thirteen separate independent States by the Declaration of Independence; but no international act of any consequence, by virtue of the Foreign sovereignty, was ever done by any one State as to European nations, nor by these as to that. Practically, Europe knew nothing of the several States. She only knew the Confederacy of States. This was still more manifest after the Confederation; for then all the branches of the foreign sovereignty were vested in Congress, as the international representative, as, indeed, they had been in all material respects, before. But when the National Constitution of 1789 was adopted, beyond all question, under that every atom of foreign sovereignty is stripped from the States and vested in the new Government. Every attribute of international existence is parted with; and no State can ever be repossessed of any one of them, but by a successful civil war, or by the consent of the rest to a dissolution of the Union, and the restoration of the deeded authority to the States."

"South Carolina, practically, never was known as a nation. The very idea would excite a smile in every Cabinet of Europe. Theoretically, as well as practically, she is now, beyond all doubt, utterly unknown by her own act, under the Constitution of 1789. It would be idle to talk to European nations about reserved rights. The answer would be, we know you not. We know the Government of the United States; the President as the head of the Diplomatic department; the President and the Senate as the Treaty-making authority; the President, Senate and House of Representatives as the war-declaring power. These we know, and, as represented by them, we know the United States as one nation. But who are you? Your own act justifies and requires us to regard you as not a nation, as only a part of one."

"If the State had yielded nothing but the jurisdiction over international subjects, it is obvious that she will have lost the most prominent and important attributes of sovereignty, because she ceased to be a nation under the law of nations. But she yielded a large and most important portion of the highest attributes of domestic sovereignty. She gave up the power to coin money, to emit bills of credit, to authorize any tender but in gold and silver, to pass bills of exchequer, ex post facto laws, or those which impair the obligation of contracts, or to grant any title of nobility. She agreed to no duties or imposts, but with the consent of Con-